

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 23, 25, 29, 37, and 39 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 23, 25, 29, 37, and 39 are amended and Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, 30, 31, 34-36, 38, and 40-45 are canceled by the present amendment. The changes to Claims 9, 11, 23, 25, 37, and 39 correct dependency, and the changes to Claims 1, 15, and 29 incorporate the subject matter of Claims 8, 22, and 36, respectively. Thus, no new matter is added.

Further, the present amendment is properly filed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Claims 1, 15, and 29 are Claims 8, 22, and 36, respectively, re-written in independent form. Further, the pending dependent claims depended from Claims 8, 22, or 29. Thus, no new issues are raised by the pending claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6-17, 20-31, and 33-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hidaka, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0094887, herein "Hidaka"); Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kobayashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,793, herein "Kobayashi") in view of Sashida (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,440 B1); Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Sashida, further in view of Jacobson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,924,686, herein "Jacobson"); and Claims 13, 27, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Sashida, further in view of Hamamoto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,581 B1, herein "Hamamoto").

Rejections of Canceled Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, 30, 31, 34-36, 38, and 40-45 are moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the pending

Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 23, 25, 29, 37, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103. Because Claims 1, 15, and 29 incorporate the subject matter of Claims 8, 22, and 36, respectively, the rejections of Claims 8, 22, and 36 are addressed in the discussion of amended Claims 1, 15, and 29.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Hidaka anticipates all the pending claims.

Amended Claim 1 recites “a **first detecting device is disposed on a sheet feeding path between the sheet pick-up device and the sheet separating device.**”

As shown at Fig. 15, for example, sensor 500 is disposed between the sheet pick-up device 7 and the contact between the sheet feeding belt 9 and the reverse roller 10, which functions as the sheet separating device, while at least two detecting devices 11 and 501 are located between the sheet separating device and pull-out rollers 12.

However, Hidaka **fails to show a sensor between the sheet pick-up device and the sheet separating device.** Thus, Hidaka does not teach or suggest at least a first detecting device as defined by amended Claim 1.

Amended Claims 15 and 29 also recite “a **first detecting device is disposed on a sheet feeding path between the sheet pick-up device and the sheet separating device.**”

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claim 1, Claims 9 and 11, which depend therefrom, Claim 15, Claims 23 and 25, which depend therefrom, Claim 29, and Claims 37 and 39, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

With regard to amended Claim 1, which incorporates Claim 8, the outstanding Office Action asserts Kobayashi as teaching every element except a sheet separating device comprising a roller, which it asserts Sashida as teaching, and a display device, which it

asserts Jacobson as teaching. The outstanding Office Action does not assert any reference as teaching the first detecting device as defined by amended Claim 1.

The outstanding Office Action asserts, at page 6, that “when” is conditional and, based on the rejections, gives no consideration whatsoever to the claim features reciting “**when a first slip ratio** of the first sheet fed in the sheet feeding path between the sheet pick-up device and the first detecting device **exceeds a first slip threshold value**, the control device is configured to **display first information** on the display device, **when a second slip ratio** of the first sheet fed in the sheet feeding path between the first and the at least two detecting devices **exceeds a second slip threshold value**, the control device is configured to **display second information** on the display device.”

However, the outstanding Office Action cites no support in the MPEP for merely ignoring claim elements that are not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

Even read broadly, the above-quoted claim elements at least define the control device configured to display first information and second information. To the contrary, Jacobson, which is asserted to teach a display device as defined by amended Claim 1, only describes a signal indicating a jam but does not teach or suggest display of first information and display of second information.

Further, Kobayashi does not teach or suggest at least the “at least two detecting devices, both located between the sheet separating device and the pull-out rollers, side-by-side, substantially in line in the sheet feeding direction and configured to detect a leading edge of the first sheet before the first sheet reaches the pull-out rollers,” as recited by Claim 1.

The outstanding Office Action cites, at page 3, the size sensor 45, the register sensor 47, and the empty sensor 38 as detecting devices. However, while the size sensor 45 is described as detecting a leading edge of the document, at column 8, lines 48-49, of

Kobayashi, the empty sensor 38 and register sensor 47 do not teach or suggest “detecting devices...configured to detect a leading edge of the first sheet,” as recited by Claim 1. In fact, the description, at column 8, lines 51-53, states that “[t]he separated and transferred document is soon detected by a first register sensor 47, and after a T2 time period, the DC motor M2 stops.” Thus, not only is Kobayashi silent regarding the first register sensor 47 detecting a leading edge of the first sheet, but Kobayashi is also silent regarding the basis for stopping the DC motor M2, which is a time period T2, being related to “a detection result” of detecting the leading edge of the first sheet by the first register sensor 47.

Sashida and Jacobson do not cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi with regard to Claim 1 and are not asserted for the above-discussed features of Claim 1 that are deficient in Kobayashi.

Amended Claims 15 and 29, which incorporate Claims 22 and 36, respectively, patentably define over the cited references for similar reasons as those discussed with regard to Claim 1.

Claims 9 and 11 depend from Claim 1, Claims 23 and 25 depend from Claim 15, and Claims 37 and 39 depend from Claim 29.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 23, 25, 29, 37, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Usha M. Parker  
Registration No. 61,939